REMARKS

Claim 1, for example, has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 8.

Dependent claim 8 was rejected under Section 102 based on Balmer. Dependent claim 8 called for the master processor to provide the timing for the other processors. Cited in support of the rejection is column 3, lines 10-17. It is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in this material to enable one to deduce that the processor in Balmer provides a timing for other processors. Likewise, the material in columns 4 and 5 appears to have nothing to do with timing.

Finally, the material cited in column 12 does indicate that the master processor is used for scheduling. But the master processor is not responsible for timing. This is better understood from columns 19-22 under the heading Synchronized MIMD. There, it is explained that, in effect, the system used in Balmer is a peer-to-peer timing arrangement. There is no master that provides the timing for the other processors. For example, at column 19, lines 27-32, it is explained that "once the code for starting a synchronized instruction stream arrives at a processor, that processor, and all the processors in the synchronized set, can only execute instructions in locked step with each other until such time as the end of the synchronized code instruction is encountered."

More poignantly, it is pointed out that "using this approach, no messages need be transferred between processors ... ." See column 19, lines 33 and 34. In the same vein, it is explained that "no external control, other than the instruction stream, is required to establish the synchronization relationships between processors." Thus, in contrast to a system which uses a central or master control to achieve timing, the timing in the cited reference appears to be peer-to-peer and that each processor independently controls itself to operate in locked step with the other processors. Since no external communications are used for timing, it would be impossible for the master processor to control any of the other processors' timing.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested since claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 8.

For the same reason, claim 16, amended to include the subject matter of claim 17, should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 7, 2006

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation